

kinds & manners

Semantics 3, UCLA Linguistics

Spring 2022

1 this week's goals

- what's a kind?
- what's a manner?
- our usual morphosyntactic tests for both
- some considerations for how to encode them (cross-linguistically)

2 kinds, a quick overview

- genericity: what is it?
- kind terms: what do they look like? how are they interpreted? (see also Chierchia, 1998)
 - (1) a. Curious people gathered around the entertainers.
 - b. Curious people like to travel a lot. \exists
generic
- evidence against an ambiguity approach (much more in Carlson (1977)):¹
 - we've got generic-only interps, e.g. *Smokers are rude*
 - we've got existential-only interps, e.g. *A saw ants on the ground*
- are there predicates that select for kind terms?
- are there quantifiers or demonstratives that can range over kinds? that are dedicated to kinds?
- a few theoretical options:
 1. kind terms behave like they do because they're bound by a generic operator
 2. kind terms denote kinds (Carlson, 1977)
 3. (some combination of the two)
- a word of caution about trying to use a generic operator to pick a particular number/proportion:
 - (2) a. Seeds don't germinate.
 - b. Bees are sterile.(false, though most don't)
(false, though all but queen and drone are)

¹Anaphora is funny! Data from Carlson (1977); Krifka (2004).

- (i) a. Mary hates raccoons because they stole her sweet corn.
- b. Raccoons stole Mary's sweet corn, so now she hates them.
- (ii) a. At the meeting, martians claimed PRO to be almost extinct.
- b. *At the meeting, some martians claimed PRO to be almost extinct.

- see Carlson for other problems with a quantifier-based account, i.e. it doesn't scope with e.g. negation
- the Carlson approach, roughly:
 - bare plurals denote kinds
 - * the generic reading comes about when the kind-denoting DP combines with an individual-level predicate
 - * the existential reading comes about when it combines with a stage-level predicate

(3) $\llbracket \text{widespread} \rrbracket = \lambda x_k. \text{widespread}(x)$

- (4) a. $\llbracket \text{available} \rrbracket = \lambda x_s. \text{available}(x)$
 b. $\llbracket \text{available} \rrbracket = \lambda P \lambda x_i \exists y_s [R(y, x) \wedge P(y)]$
 c. $\llbracket \text{A is available} \rrbracket = \exists y_s [R(y, a) \wedge \text{available}(y)]$

- a few known problems with Carlson, including wide scope effects; modification by e.g. PPs, binding into possessives, etc.
- also, some straightforward counterexamples (Diesing, 1988):

(5) a. Hospital patients are sick.
 b. People in bars are drunk.

(6) Hurricanes arise in this part of the South Pacific.

3 manners, a quick overview

- manners: what are they?
- do we have manner proforms?
- what about quantifiers?
- where do we expect to see manners? (do states have manners? cf. *illegally parked*)
- where do they come from?
- verbal similatives (Caponigro, 2004; Rett, 2013)

(7) A danced as B sang.

(8) $\llbracket \text{as } P \rrbracket = \lambda y. P^{[y/x]}$

4 cross-linguistic syncretism: degrees, kinds, and manners

- Anderson and Morzycki (2015):
 1. there is a cross-linguistic syncretism between degrees, kinds, and manners
 2. we should thus treat them as ranging over the same sort of thing: effectively, degrees+
- some data (Polish):

- (9) a. taki pies jak ten
 such-MASC dog *wh* this
 'such a dog as this', 'a dog of this kind'

kind

- b. zachowywać się tak jak Clyde
 behave REFL such WH Clyde
 'behave like Clyde' *manner*
- c. tak wysoki jak Clyde
 such tall WH Clyde
 'as tall as Clyde' *degree*

- more data (German):

- (10) a. so ein Hund wie dieser
 such a dog WH this
 'a dog such as this' *kind*
- b. Jan hat so wie Maria getanzt.
 J has such WH M danced
 'John danced the way Mary did.' *manner*
- c. Ich bin so gross wie Peter.
 I a m such tall as Peter
 'I am as tall as Peter.' *degree*

- more data (Japanese):

- (11) a. Dono-yoo-na hon -o yomimasu ka.
 WH book -acc read Q
 'What kind of book do you read?' *kind*
- b. Dono-yoo-ni setsumee-shimashita ka.
 WH explanation-did Q
 'How did you explain it?' *manner*

- how compelling do we find this?

- a few bids out there for supplementing the notion of a degree:

- (what's the old notion again?)
- evidence for dimension of measurement
- evidence for... topic? (Moltmann, 2013)

- (12) a. Clyde's height is impressive.
 b. ??Six feet is impressive.

- manner-like modifiers of adjectives (Katz, 2008)

- (13) a. The talk was oddly unnerving.
 b. Clyde is openly contemptuous.

- past efforts:

- 'enriched degrees' for some truly bizarre reasons (Grosu and Landman, 1998)
- 'tropes' (instantiations of properties), a sort of hard-to-pin-down innovation Moltmann (2013)

- solution:

- ontology: events, states, kinds
- the notion of a kind: "If that's what a kind is – the plurality of all possible objects of some type – then for any atomic type in the model, there is a kind counterpart." p804

- manners: event kinds
 - * Portner (1991): gerunds like *eating green beans* denote event kinds (cf. *Eating green beans is getting popular these days*)
- degrees: (one kind of) state kind(s)
- some formalism:
 - * $\cup k$ is the non-kind counterpart of kind k
 - * $\cap o$ is the kind counterpart of non-kind o (where o ranges over all non-kind objects)
 - * plus an incredibly non-standard adaptation of Predicate Modification, wherein $\langle o, t \rangle$ and $\langle e, t \rangle$ can combine to form an individual predicate (p809)
- degrees:

(14) a. $\llbracket \text{six feet} \rrbracket = \lambda s. \cup \text{six-ft}(s)$
 b. $\llbracket \text{tall} \rrbracket = \lambda x \lambda s. \text{tall}(s, x)$ ‘ x has a certain tallness’
 c. $\llbracket \text{Floyd is six feet tall} \rrbracket = \lambda s. \text{tall}(s, \text{floyd}) \wedge \cup \text{six-feet}(s)$
- manners

(15) $\llbracket \text{Floyd sang as Clyde sang} \rrbracket = \exists k [\exists e [\text{sing}(e, \text{clyde}) \wedge \cup k(e)] \wedge \exists e' [\text{sing}(e, \text{floyd}) \wedge \cup k(e')]]$
 (There is a manner event-kind which both Clyde’s singing and Floyd’s singing instantiate)
- anaphors:

(16) $\llbracket \text{tak} \rrbracket = \lambda k \lambda o. \cup k(o)$
- some issues:
 - missing readings

(17) a. #Floyd ran six miles, and Clyde ran as Floyd did.
 b. #Floyd was contemptuously rude, and Clyde was as rude as Floyd.
 - these words (e.g. as in English, wie in German) can range over a hell of a lot of other things
 - conflicting constraints on reducing our ontology by merging types of entities

5 summing up the course!!

- my goals:
 - introducing you to non-standard phenomena
 - introducing you to non-standard domains & formalism
 - acquainting you with some bigger-picture views on what the constraints on semantic theory can and should be
 - (encouraging you to work on underrepresented topics, if not languages... all the better to inform our theory with)
- we developed some *a priori* tests for entityhood in our ontology, based on the argument-from-analogy in Partee (1973)
- they led us to include a lot of basic types! and their plurals...
 - individuals, worlds

- times, events, situations
- degrees, vectors
- (manners, kinds)
- and to witness a lot of cross-domain parallels
 - monotonicity / homogeneity / quantization
 - mereology and plurals, notions of maximality
 - formation of relative clauses
 - quantification and domain restriction
 - interpretation of missing arguments
- and some hints that there is an attractive universal typology: {individuals, times/events, worlds} > {degrees}
- but there is still lots of room for idiosyncratic editorializing
 - don't like vectors? call them 'directed scale segments,' etc.
 - are times more closely associated with degrees, because of their linearity? or events, because of their homomorphism?
 - (what does it mean to have a homomorphism from a lattice to a line?)
 - should we group events, worlds, and times together as situations?...
 - ...or events and individuals together, to explain the widespread polysemy?
 - (same with degrees qua vectors or state kinds)
- and of course lots and lots of room for more semantic innovation!

references

- Anderson, C. and Morzycki, M. (2015). Degrees as kinds. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 33:791–828.
- Caponigro, I. (2004). The semantic contribution of *wh*-words and type shifts: evidence from free relatives cross-linguistically. In *Proceedings of SALT 14*. CLC Publications.
- Carlson, G. (1977). *Reference to Kinds in English*. PhD Thesis, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Chierchia, G. (1998). Reference to kinds across languages. *Natural Language Semantics*, 6:339–405.
- Diesing, M. (1988). Bare plural subjects and the stage/individual contrast. Ms., UMass Amherst.
- Grosu, A. and Landman, F. (1998). Strange relatives of the third kind. *Natural Language Semantics*, 6:125–170.
- Katz, G. (2008). Manner modification of state verbs. In McNally, L. and Kennedy, C., editors, *Adjectives and adverbs*. Oxford.
- Krifka, M. (2004). Bare NPs: Kind-referring, indefinites, both, or neither? In *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT) XIII*. CLC Publications.
- Moltmann, F. (2013). *Abstract Objects and the Semantics of Natural Language*. Oxford University Press.
- Partee, B. (1973). Some structural analogies between tenses and pronouns in English. *The Journal of Philosophy*, 7:601–609.
- Portner, P. (1991). Gerunds and types of events. In *Proceedings of SALT 1*. CLC Publications.
- Rett, J. (2013). Similitives and the degree arguments of verbs. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 31:1101–1137.